

Attachment 4: List of Public Review Comments

This material includes public comments received through emails and letters submitted directly to City staff by individuals.

It is analyzed through the following framework:

<u>Issue ID</u>	<u>Definition</u>
1	Incorporated, either partially or fully, into updated Adoption Draft materials.
2	Not incorporated: this comment is already addressed or in alignment with proposed materials, no change needed.
3	Not incorporated at this time: this comment points to work that is anticipated to be followed up in the future, after the completion of this project.
4	Not incorporated: this comment raises issues that are outside the scope of this project.
5	Not incorporated: this comment is not supported by adopted policy or in alignment with project goals or methodology.
6	Not incorporated: this comment is not applicable or not legally supportable

NOTE: See the staff report for a summary of key themes from comments and responses.

Page	Comment ID	Comment	Comment Response ID
8	3023	Workforce housing is still needed in Industrial place types. Not allowing workforce housing, security housing and support for these uses will make the areas dependent on cars and is very short sighted for the future growth of our community.	4
7	3029	CD-1 goes against the Long Range Plan adopted by City Council. It takes away affordable and equitable housing solutions from Missoulians. Replace all CD-1 uses with CD-2 uses so Missoula has more housing opportunities over the next 20 years and brings the new zoning into compliance with the Long Range Plan as adopted by the City Council	4
7	3159	Councilman Campbell's amendments approved 100% by city council has been modified from what was approved and should be corrected per the approved amendment text and bullet location as published in the City Council meeting.	6
3	3160	I do not agree with this. I think this amendment is occurring because of zoning intent proposed in the UDC that does not comply with the actual language of the Long Range plan. The Long Range plan is supposed to drive zoning and not the reverse. If the Airport issue needs to be added because it was overlooked do it in its own sentence and do not amend the original text as it is much more equitable than the proposed change.	2
3	3161	Leave this language as it is more in line with what I believe the community supports over the amended language.	6
3	3177	I am not comfortable with this language as it is giving an unelected Citizen board power over land use decisions outside of the Planning Board. I believe it has been shown clearly that Citizen boards outside of the planning board cannot be trusted with land use decisions which is why the State has taken that authority away from them. I think the language goes against housing opportunities for future population growth. I agree that the existing runway hazard should be taken into account but NOT under the language of the Long Range Plan as Runways can be replaced and moved while buildings have a lifespan of 100+ years. The buildings should have priority over a runway which may last a few decades.	6

	I think the original text unamended language is more in line with what citizens want. Hills and Hillside are not the same thing. I think proposed zoning language is the impetus for these changes and not the Long Range Plan controlling the zoning. I do not believe these changes should be	
3	3178 accepted.	5
	I think this language is more accurate in creating a broader picture of what Missoulians want. The revised statements do not appear to capture the intent of the original language and focuses to much on the airport and other plans which should not have authority over the the Long Range Plan. The Long Range Plan is the bigger picture for Missoula and should rule above all. A neighborhood plan is good for that area but may change frequently or could be deleted if it doesn't meet the needs of the area. The Long Range plan should be the overall vision and not subordinate to a	
4	3179 neighborhood plan. Keep the original bigging picture language.	5
4	3180 Delete	6
4	3181 Delete	6
4	3182 Delete	6
	I do not think noise has a place in this text. A building can be designed to	
5	3183 reduce airport noise.	5
	I do not think residential uses should be limited as it goes against the need for Housing in the valley. Residential uses are really quite limited in intensity. If a plane hit a Costco at a high use time it would be far more lethal then hitting a 30 Unit residential building. Air travel is also one of the safest means of travel. I think the language proposed and reality of the	
5	3184 hazard is not balanced in this language.	5
6	3185 I d not think Noise should be included.	5
	I do not think Residential density is really an issue. I agree a stadium, or assembly use with 350 or more people in a single building should built in	
6	3186 the hazard zone.	5
6	3187 I would delete Noise.	5
	I do not think Residential density is really an issue. I agree a stadium, or assembly use with 350 or more people in a single building should built in	
6	3188 the hazard zone.	5
6	3189 I would delete noise	5
	I do not think Residential density is really an issue. I agree a stadium, or assembly use with 350 or more people in a single building should built in	
6	3190 the hazard zone.	5
	I would add a commercial place type for significant intersections or along	
7	3191 arterial streets so the City can grow inward.	4

7	I would add a commercial place type for significant intersections or along 3192 arterial streets so the City can grow inward.	4
7	I would add a commercial place type for significant intersections or along 3193 arterial streets so the City can grow inward.	4
7	I do not think CD-1 has a place in the Code. It is too limited in uses that could benefit the public. It stops affordable housing which may be in partnership with the government entity. CD-1 also stops commercial uses 3194 that may be in partnership with a government entity.	4
11	I think this is an inappropriate change that will take away housing opportunities for Missoula. These are all small lots and should have the 3195 ability to provide housing by places of employment.	5
15	Isn't this a shared parking lot with a business? If this didn't allow the business to continue as a neighborhood gathering space I would not 3196 support it.	4
22	I think this would make a better home site with a Public Park access 3197 easement on it.	6